

From: [Casey, Carolyn](#)
To: craig@cummings.com
Cc: [Wainberg, Daniel](#); [Zucker, Audrey](#); [Bruce Hoskins](#); [Gregory Flaherty](#)
Subject: FW: USM Conf call follow-up and BERA WP elements response
Date: Thursday, March 15, 2018 5:08:00 PM
Attachments: [response BERA WP elements.pdf](#)

Response to the BERA WP elements letter is attached.

Also, just a few follow up notes from the 3/12 conference call on the progress report comments.

Regarding the request for advice on how to respond,

- Where the comments stated that further discussion/evaluation may be needed, it is expected that this will be addressed in subsequent submittals as appropriate.
- EPA does not need revised progress reports. The first comment regarding well development required discussion prior to additional groundwater sampling so the additional comments were provided at the same time FYI. The additional comments were provided now so that they can be addressed as necessary in subsequent submittals.
- You may want to provide a response to comments for the record but some of these comments would most appropriately be addressed in a data QA/QC evaluation summary and/or uncertainty discussion (e.g., explanation of the sample temperature issues, custody seals, incomplete data sets, etc.) contained in the investigation summary report/risk assessment.

Regarding the comment about the final canister vacuum being closer to negative 7. This is a rule of thumb provided in discussions with our laboratory personnel. Some available guidance may specify the ending canister pressure should be between negative 2 and negative 5 inches of Hg. The most important point here is that the canister pressure should not reach zero.